Case 3:13-cr-00423-RS Document 4 Filed 06/28/13 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 13-0927 NS
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACE D
Jose Alfredo Garcia - Sunez	JUN 2 8 2013
Speedy Trial Act from June 28, 2013 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of	d on July 3, 2013, the Court excludes time under the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § d bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance wo See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	uld be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to e	plex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial lished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	uld deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance wo counsel's other scheduled case co See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv	auld unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given symmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance wo necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv	uld unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time n, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 6/25/	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney